

<b>Description</b>	County Planning Board August 11, 2009		
<b>Date</b>	08/11/2009	<b>Location</b>	County Planning Board
<b>Time</b>	<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Note</b>	
<a href="#">6:04:37 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Call to Order. Members present: Kerry White, Marianne Jackson Amsden, C.B. Dormire, Don Seifert, Mike McKenna, Doug Espelien, Julien Morice, Susan Riggs, Byron Anderson, and Pat Davis. Staff Present: County Administrator Earl Mathers, County Planner Randy Johnson and Recording Secretary Glenda Howze.	
<a href="#">6:04:46 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Public Comment. There was no public comment on items not on the agenda.	
<a href="#">6:04:57 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Approval of July 28, 2009 Minutes (continued until later in the meeting)	
<a href="#">6:05:11 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Planning Department Update	
<a href="#">6:05:15 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	Noted that the transportation amendments to the Subdivision Regulations was continued until next week. The Planning Department did have a subsequent meeting with legal staff, Terry Threlkeld and other engineers, and members from the Road Department to fine tune the document and address some of their concerns. It appears that the group did reach a consensus and the revised document will go before the Commission on August 18th. Planner Chris Scott requested that one of the members of the Planning Board subcommittee attend that hearing in order to answer any questions on matters that came from the work of that group. [President White offered to attend the meeting. The County Commission passed the Resolution of Intent to adopt the Four Corners Zoning Regulation. It was a good hearing with approximately 90% consensus of those in the District. The Commission also adopted the Middle Cottonwood zone text amendment that was previously heard by the Planning Board. Also noted that the Planning Department has received 15 applications thus far in the month of August and are very busy.	
<a href="#">6:08:24 PM</a>		Discussion between board members and staff regarding the passage of the Resolution of Intent, emailing of Board packets, and the possibility of getting comparable numbers to the previous year on the monthly report from the Planning Department. [Members McKenna, Riggs, Davis and Morice prefer to have their packets emailed when at all possible.]	

<a href="#">6:16:45 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Approval of July 28, 2009 Minutes.
<a href="#">6:17:02 PM</a>	Byron Anderson	The minutes of July 28, 2009 timestamp 6:03:43 - should say "The Commission" rather than "We" - the Commission increased the Planning Board's budget.
<a href="#">6:18:38 PM</a>		The minutes stand approved as amended.
<a href="#">6:18:46 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Regular Agenda
<a href="#">6:18:53 PM</a>		a. Committee Reports
<a href="#">6:20:00 PM</a>	Byron Anderson	Budget Committee - No report at this time. [The Commission will not adopt the budget until September after the Department of Revenue has the numbers to each County.]
<a href="#">6:21:36 PM</a>	Susan Riggs	Neighborhood Planning/Community Outreach - There are two people on this committee at this time with Gail no longer being on the board. [Reorganization will be done to place three people on this committee.]
<a href="#">6:22:43 PM</a>	Mike McKenna	Subdivision Regulations - No report at this time.
<a href="#">6:22:52 PM</a>	Pat Davis	Growth Policy Review - The committee met and made recommended changes. The group is waiting for Sean to get a paper copy of those recommendations to the committee so that they can be discussed then with the whole board. They were hoping to have this report last month.
<a href="#">6:23:23 PM</a>	Marianne Jackson Amsden	TCC - No report at this time. Board members were participating in the Interconnect Challenge at the time of the last meeting.
<a href="#">6:23:53 PM</a>	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Trails/Gallatin County Interconnect - The first roundtable discussion following the Interconnect Challenge is to be held this Thursday. There will be eight roundtable discussions total. This is the next step in the grant. Ada has summarized what was learned from the Challenge and now they are proceeding.
<a href="#">6:24:54 PM</a>	C.B. Dormire	Wastewater - The requests for proposals for the second engineering study was published and there were three proposals submitted in response. The committee has met and gone over the procedures to be followed. Detailed the process for rating the proposals as well as rating the interviews that will follow. Following the interviews the top ranking firm will be selected and negotiations will commence with that firm. If those negotiations aren't successful then it would be permissible to go to the second ranked firm for further negotiations. The process is a standardized way to meet federal and state regulations. The initial process is to

		pick the firm that is most qualified and then negotiate the work and price. All of that will be subject to the decisions on budget matters. Once the contract has been negotiated, it will come back to the [Planning] Board for approval then to the Commission for their approval if that is the appropriate step. The current timeline is to have the selection made by the week after next.
<a href="#">6:30:32 PM</a>	Don Seifert	Gravel Pit Task Force - Outlined the discussions that have taken place as well as the Plan as is anticipated to be approved by the committee at tomorrow's meeting. The goal of the task force has been to provide predictability for neighbors, operators and planners. The Commission said they want a seat at the table when it came to gravel pits and the only way to have a place at the table is to zone and go through CUP process. Provided a detailed description and drawing of the draft plans.
<a href="#">6:38:20 PM</a>		Questions and discussion between Board members and Mr. Seifert on the Gravel Pit Task Force work and plans.
<a href="#">6:45:26 PM</a>		b. Work Plan discussion
<a href="#">6:46:20 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	In May the Commission held a workshop and discussed their planning priorities for the next fiscal year. Staff compiled this discussion and their decisions into a document and then divided a strategy to accomplish these tasks. [Distributed a memo to the Commission from the Planning Department.] The memo broke the priorities down into tasks, assigned staff and established target dates for completion of each task. Provided further details on the memo to explain the thought processes behind the document and distribution of work load. Planning Staff will work with the County Commission to identify the specific sections to be worked on - Section 6E (fire protection) and Appendix I. The proportional reimbursement will also be addressed.
<a href="#">6:51:06 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Planning staff will prepare an initial draft of the changes, present it to the Planning Board subcommittee for their review and comment, and then it will come before the Board as a whole.
<a href="#">6:51:28 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	With the comprehensive amendments I'd like to do as much work ahead of time as I can, working with the County Attorney staff, bring in the statutory things. We'll then bring it to the subcommittee for their review before the whole Board. The County staff working on this will be Randy, Deputy County Attorney Jecyn Bremer and Planner Chris Scott.
<a href="#">6:52:09 PM</a>	President Kerry White	The areas that will be addressed will be Fire Regulations, proportional reimbursement and the Donut Regulations, not necessarily in that order.
<a href="#">6:52:16 PM</a>	Randy	I oversee more of the current review in our department. I have

	Johnson, County Planner	established those as priorities. The Donut Regulations are in need of a lot of changes.
<a href="#">6:52:46 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Questioned the TDR and TDC's and how they were included in the Four Corners regulation.
<a href="#">6:53:13 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	I believe that they provided a placeholder to provide for the opportunity to increase density through TDR's. We are going to do the same thing in the Donut. There might be opportunity where we could look at, for example, Bridger Canyon, Spring Hill, the possibility of those districts wanting to send rights out. Would it be in the public interest to accept those additional densities in our growth areas? This is one thing that we are going to try and pursue. I will provide a placeholder in the Donut Regulations to allow for intra-district transfers between the AS, this might be a good thing.
<a href="#">6:54:06 PM</a>	Mike McKenna	I know that the realtors gave a comprehensive document to the Planning Department regarding the TDR's. One of the big issues that they had with the TDR's was that they had was that they could be considered securities. This needs to be thoroughly vetted out as we go forward.
<a href="#">6:54:32 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	I think that we have some feedback on that from the U of M School of Law to answer those questions. I have also gotten feedback that the whole overall TDR process and mechanism seems to be very complicated. Some of the concerns include the appraisal process, who pays and who doesn't, what happens if it does come out as they expected, the potential for it not being as predictable as originally thought, and the administrative aspect.
<a href="#">6:55:21 PM</a>	Mike McKenna	My question is whether it is still being considered?
<a href="#">6:55:27 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	The Commission is still considering this a possibility and would like to pursue the possibility of a TDR/TDC program.
<a href="#">6:55:38 PM</a>	Mike McKenna	Asked if there is anyone on the Planning Board working with the Planning Department on this.
<a href="#">6:55:50 PM</a>	President Kerry White	The GPIP committee was put on hold when they shelved the county-wide zoning effort. The Neighborhood Planning/Community Outreach plans are on the priority list from the Commission.
<a href="#">6:56:29 PM</a>		Discussion regarding the Planning Department's assistance to the City of Belgrade.
<a href="#">6:56:53 PM</a>	Susan Riggs	I wanted to clarify with the subcommittees on each of these six.

		Asked if the Transportation Subdivision Regulation committee would transfer into the Fire Regulations Committee or if the committees would be reformed.
<a href="#">6:57:11 PM</a>	President Kerry White	The subdivision regulation, which is Mike, C.B. and Byron, the one they were working on was Transportation. The next ones the staff will work on are the Fire Regulations, proportional reimbursement and the Donut Regulations.
<a href="#">6:57:59 PM</a>	Marianne Jackson Amsden	I was having the same questions, wanting to make sure that there is a Planning Board liaison on each of these priorities that the Planning Department can be running drafts by. I wasn't sure if the Donut Regulation really fit into the same subcommittee that would be doing the Fire and proportional reimbursement. Subdivision Regulations seem very different than the Donut Zoning. I'd like to throw my hat in the ring for the Donut Zoning committee.
<a href="#">6:58:42 PM</a>		Discussion regarding placement of Board members on the various subcommittees.
<a href="#">7:00:57 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	Stated that he has an initial draft of the changes to the donut regulations that needs some minor revisions and then could go out to the subcommittee for its review.
<a href="#">7:01:14 PM</a>	Byron Anderson	Stated that he has a motion to make regarding transportation planning. [Discussion regarding whether or not a motion would be out of order based on the agenda language. The President determined to allow the motion and vote.] Motion that the Gallatin County Planning Board recommend to the Gallatin County County Commission that they place funding for the Airport Interchange on I90 as a number one priority in the County Transportation Plan to help Senators Baucus and Tester secure said funding from the funds that they have recently requested from the Senate Budget.
<a href="#">7:02:43 PM</a>	Pat Davis	Second.
<a href="#">7:02:50 PM</a>		Board discussion.
<a href="#">7:02:53 PM</a>	Byron Anderson	Noted a press release that he found on the Gallatin Field Airport Authority website and stated that customers to the airport deserve more than to have to weave in and out of Belgrade to get to the Interstate. This project is way overdue and it is time that it is brought to the attention of the Commissioners and should be a major effort in our transportation plan.
<a href="#">7:04:25 PM</a>	Julien Morice	It was my understanding that it wasn't as shovel ready as it needed to be to qualify for the stimulus money. I'm not sure what wasn't done so that we were ready and question why we were so behind the eight ball on that.

<a href="#">7:04:51 PM</a>	County Administrator Earl Mathers	I can respond in part. We have been working on this project for over two years trying to piece together funding from a variety of sources. The State of Montana has a vested interest in this as well. Everyone has been working on our congressional delegation in a fairly intermittent but consistent manner to get funding even before ARRA was announced. Some of the money has been assembled and is available. In response to what Julien was saying, some of the preliminary engineering work is done. There is a lot of engineering work that will be required and that costs a lot of money. There has been some reluctance on the part of both the State and Gallatin County to commit fully to doing all the engineering if there is no assurance that we would have the capital project funds to complete the work. I can assure you that this is a very, very high priority of the Commission and may be Commissioner Murdock's single highest priority. This is very much on our radar screen and have been working on a variety of ways to get a secure revenue stream established because it is going to take time and it isn't going to come in one fiscal year. We just need the assurance over the life of the project that the funds are there. There may be a possible link to ARRA and some of the monies that the state has received through that program I believe have been designated for that project but I'm not sure of that.
<a href="#">7:07:30 PM</a>		Vote: 7-3; Members White, Seifert and Dormire opposed.
<a href="#">7:08:02 PM</a>	Julien Morice	Asked when the Four Corners regulation will be implemented and if you are wanting to build a structure or subdivide within that District if there will be a separate committee or governing body that you will have to report to in addition to the County or will it be solely up to the County to regulate and review applications?
<a href="#">7:08:43 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	The action today was the Commission passing a resolution of intent to adopt. State law requires a 30-day protest period. If you have 40% or more of the property owners with agricultural interests sign a petition and it is confirmed, the Commission can't adopt the district. Following the 30-day protest period, the Commission will hear the resolution to adopt the district on September 15th and we will have our 22nd zoning district and it is a part 2 district so the Planning Board will consider everything but a variance in that district and provide a recommendation to the Commission. The Commission will take final action after that. Variances will go before the Board of Adjustment. In terms of subdivision it will be business as usual with it coming before the Planning Board and then the Commission. Once it is formally adopted there will be land use permits, sign permits, etc., that pertain to that District. Perhaps Warren could give workshop on process if that would help.

<a href="#">7:10:38 PM</a>	President Kerry White	We still review all major subdivisions in the County whether they are in 101 or 201's. With zoning regulations there is a difference between a change in the regulations within the District whether you're in a 101 or 201. The Zoning District should provide more predictability as to what is allowed in each area.
<a href="#">7:11:05 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	Four Corners will have specific standards regarding signs, parking lots, accessory units, density, etc. For the most part the administration of district is standardized between the districts so that process shouldn't be changed and if there are different processes they will be minor.
<a href="#">7:11:33 PM</a>	C.B. Dormire	Asked for an explanation of Item 6 on the Commission priority memo. Asked if the Rural Cluster Development is being separated from the GPIP efforts.
<a href="#">7:12:00 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	The Commission has asked us to look at the possibility of taking those Rural Cluster standards that were part of the "county-wide" and see if there is a way to incorporate those into the subdivision regulations and also to bolster the Growth Policy in terms of adhering to the basic cluster principles in the rural most parts of the County. This will require not only an update to the Growth Policy but also amendments to the PUD section of the subdivision regulations to help implement and provide a process for the rural cluster.
<a href="#">7:12:43 PM</a>	C.B. Dormire	You mentioned TDR's and the placeholder concept that has been scattered through various things and projects. Noted in the Four Corners [regulation], it looked like that placeholder mechanism would require that if the rights were transferred from outside the Four Corners area into the Four Corners area, the same rule would apply for transfers within the District. This concept looks like the transferring property be encumbered with some sort of permanent conservation easement. That concept is very different from the one that was in the original GPIP document. Has that been a policy change on the part of the Commission?
<a href="#">7:13:56 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	I can't answer that, I don't know. I would have to speak with Warren specifically about that. One of the challenges with the whole TDR is the administration of it. There is room for improvement, if we are going to have a program it needs to work.
<a href="#">7:15:07 PM</a>	Don Seifert	Item three on the memo including the \$20,000 grant mentioned - where did that come from?
<a href="#">7:15:38 PM</a>	Randy Johnson, County Planner	That is a statutory provision that allows monies for local governments provided that it goes toward comprehensive planning. This is for infrastructure planning and financing for local governments especially in multi-jurisdictional areas. This has been

		in the works for quite awhile.
<a href="#">7:16:31 PM</a>		Discussion regarding the \$20,000 and what those funds could be spent on. This is tied to assistance from Sonoran and the Smart Growth Coalition on how to move forward.
<a href="#">7:17:21 PM</a>	Byron Anderson	For clarification, this \$20,000 will not in any way be requested from the current budget of the County Planning Board. On a separate note, asked how the update on the reverse side of the agenda is taken care of. The Four Corners item is not updated on this agenda. [It will be updated on the next agenda, was an oversight or not done due to the absence of Planning Department staff.]
<a href="#">7:19:40 PM</a>		The Kapinos two lot minor is a subsequent and will be heard by the Planning Board on August 25th. It will be on the consent agenda.
<a href="#">7:20:12 PM</a>		Meeting adjourned.

Produced by FTR Gold™  
[www.fortherecord.com](http://www.fortherecord.com)